

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment
10/19/2021	16.1 Lot Development Restrictions	There is not an option to choose 16.1 or 16.4. Perhaps this is the incorrect Article for my comment?
11/26/2021	16.1 Lot Development Restrictions	16.1 A1 b & B 3- Cottage Court is not defined unless it's capitalized and references article 14.4
11/26/2021	16.1 Lot Development Restrictions	16.1 A 1- Use of the defined term Multi-Dwelling development says you can't have townhomes on the same lot. Why Not?
11/26/2021	16.1 Lot Development Restrictions	16.1 B 4 what is Direct access? contract that to 'indirect access'
11/26/2021	16.1 Lot Development Restrictions	Item B.2 does not meet the definition of a Flag lot.
11/26/2021	16.1 Lot Development Restrictions	Item C. - prohibition of Flag Lots (as e defined on page 2-19) will increase stream impacts, take gawn more trees, & increase impervious surface for stormwater impacts. Item C needs to be deleted
11/26/2021	16.1 Lot Development Restrictions	Item D Sight triangles: Drawing on page 16-2 is not correct per Session Law 2021-121
11/26/2021	16.1 Lot Development Restrictions	item I on page 16.3 is entirely off base- obviously inserted by the out of state consultant. developer GRANT easements. the easement document spells out in each easement what structures are allowed. Prohibiting Fences will impact most of the city population. Why does the city care if the original property owner and the Utility co have an agreement that allows fences spelled out in the recorded easement. the section needs to be deleted
1/11/2022	16.1 Lot Development	16.1 A1 b & B 3- Cottage Court is not defined unless it's capitalized and references article 14.4
1/11/2022	16.1 Lot Development	16.1 A 1- Use of the defined term Multi-Dwelling development says you can't have townhomes on the same lot. Why Not?
1/11/2022	16.1 Lot Development	16.1 B 4 what is Direct access? contract that to 'indirect access' ; Item B.2 does not meet the definition of a Flag lot.
1/11/2022	16.1 Lot Development	Item C. - prohibition of Flag Lots (as e defined on page 2-19) will increase stream impacts, take gawn more trees, & increase impervious surface for stormwater impacts. Item C needs to be deleted
1/11/2022	16.1 Lot Development	Item D Sight triangles: Drawing on page 16-2 is not correct per Session Law 2021-121

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment
1/11/2022	16.1 Lot Development	item I on page 16.3 is entirely off base- obviously inserted by the out of state consultant. developer GRANT easements. the easement document spells out in each easement what structures are allowed. Prohibiting Fences will impact most of the city population. Why does the city care if the original property owner and the Utility co have an agreement that allows fences spelled out in the recorded easement. the section needs to be deleted
1/11/2022	16.1 Lot Development	16.3 B2. With no clarity on Open Space vs. Green Area / Tree Save this section makes no sense.
1/11/2022	16.1 Lot Development	Failure to provide the Administrative manual for UDO bonus make this section unreadable.
1/11/2022	16.1 Lot Development	16.4 A #2 & #3 makes no sense. Mailboxes are exempted from local ordinances as they are federally regulated (i.e. can't count in impervious area calcs by law)
1/11/2022	16.1 Lot Development	Landscape yards, stream buffers and tree save areas are all very appropriate Open Space. they needs to be allowed as Open Space (once it's defined);
1/11/2022	16.1 Lot Development	16.4.A 3 - you can count commercial structures but not mailbox kiosk? that makes no sense
1/11/2022	16.1 Lot Development	16.4B Uses exempted omitted Single family & thus conflicts with 4.4 and 5.4
1/11/2022	16.1 Lot Development	Table 16.1 contains violations of § 160D-702 in the requirements of private open space of SF, TH, etc
1/11/2022	16.1 Lot Development	16.5 mandating any width for the walkway from driveway or sidewalk to the entrance violates § 160D-702 as it is a Building Design Element (not regulated by Building code - so it is purely aesthetic) IN addition why would you want or need a 4' (or 5') lead walk to a 3' door?16.5 A needs to be deleted
1/11/2022	16.1 Lot Development	16.6A removed the construction time prohibition of 9pm to 7am. Construction & development make noise and vibration and can not be prohibited. Match muni-code Section 15-63
1/11/2022	16.1 Lot Development	Article 16.6 B is missing
1/11/2022	16.1 Lot Development	Article 16.6D (Dust) is too broad as to be unenforceable. We actually get Sahara dust in CLT during some times of the year. making it illegal doesn't make it stop
1/11/2022	16.1 Lot Development	16.6E Odors & Fumes is not authorized in the ETJ per 160A-193 (only City plus 1 mile). Examples of the extent of the over-reach as written this makes it a violation of the UDO for CMU to vent sewer gas, or to have a BBQ grill or wood-burning fireplace.
1/11/2022	16.1 Lot Development	16.7 does not exist in the released version of the UDO. What are you hiding?
1/11/2022	16.1 Lot Development	16.1 B 2. is not the correct definition of Flag Lot. Flag Lots a(item C) should not be prohibited. they are necessary to reduce stream impacts & to deal favorably with varying topography
1/11/2022	16.1 Lot Development	16.1.1 & B.3 Cottage Court is not defined term
1/11/2022	16.1 Lot Development	16.3 C - administrative Manual not available to review. Does the Bonus require a rezoning or is it Administrative?
1/11/2022	16.1 Lot Development	no definition of CLT Business INclusion or of Equitable Energy Efficiency Home Rehab
1/11/2022	16.1 Lot Development	16.4 A.1. Federally regulated utilities, mailboxes etc should not be excluded from the area calculated as open space (especially when a 500 sq ft commercial building can be counted)

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment
1/11/2022	16.1 Lot Development	table 16-1 when it merges MF with TH does not correctly state that the private open space on TH can not have design criteria (violates state law 160D-702). Some requirements violate ADA standards
1/11/2022	16.2 Exterior Lighting	B. Lighting Design Lights on top and in a parking decks have not been adequately covered.
10/27/2021	16.3 Development Bonus	Table 16-1: Why would this menu not include some of the benefits listed in section 38.2.c.3.b?
11/26/2021	16.3 Development Bonus	16.3 B2. With no clarity on Open Space vs. Green Area / Tree Save this section makes no sense.
11/26/2021	16.3 Development Bonus	Failure to provide the Administrative manual for UDO bonus make this section unreadable.
1/11/2022	16.3 Development Bonus	Height Bonus The effect of additional height on surrounding residential neighborhoods when urban development is allowed to be adjacent has not been adequately considered nor adequate offsetting compensation requested for this bonus. The addition of several floors to a building can completely change the visual character of a neighborhood where place types abut.
1/11/2022	16.3 Development Bonus	With regards to affordable housing, the fee in lieu currently established is inadequate as a trade-off. Bonus Project are required to provide true affordable housing units, or units/ land for building units elsewhere. The fee in lieu amounts currently scheduled are a fraction of the other required bonus devices, and should be adjusted or eliminated as an option.
10/19/2021	16.4 Design of On-Site Open Space	Public open space requirements do not generally garner meaningful open space. We have all seen this over time. I propose regulations that allow for offsite mitigation of open space, not unlike tree save or storm water. The mitigation would aim to allow multiparcel developments to combine open space requirements and would require design standards for onsite and offsite open space.
11/26/2021	16.4 Design of On-Site Open Space	16.4 A #2 & #3 makes no sense. Mailboxes are exempted from local ordinances as they are federally regulated (i.e. can't count in impervious area calcs by law)
11/26/2021	16.4 Design of On-Site Open Space	Landscape yards, stream buffers and tree save areas are all very appropriate Open Space. they needs to be allowed as Open Space (once it's defined)
11/26/2021	16.4 Design of On-Site Open Space	16.4.A 3 - you can count commercial structures but not mailbox kiosk? that makes no sense
11/26/2021	16.4 Design of On-Site Open Space	16.4B Uses exempted omitted Single family & thus conflicts with 4.4 and 5.4
11/26/2021	16.4 Design of On-Site Open Space	Table 16.1 contains violations of § 160D-702 in the requirements of private open space of SF, TH, etc

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment
11/26/2021	16.4 Design of On-Site Open Space	16.5 mandating any width for the walkway from driveway or sidewalk to the entrance violates § 160D-702 as it is a Building Design Element (not regulated by Building code - so it is purely aesthetic) IN addition why would you want or need a 4' (or 5') lead walk to a 3' door?
11/26/2021	16.5 On Site Pedestrian Connectivity	16.5 A needs to be deleted
10/20/2021	16.6 Performance Standards	Under the UDO section 16.6 'Noise' is says something like 'uses cannot generate noise' but much noise is not generated by 'uses' as defined. Fans, generators and equipment are not 'uses' — but the noise they generate beyond the property line should be regulated under 16.6. Either modify the definition, or change 16.6 to say 'uses and equipment' shall not.....
11/26/2021	16.6 Performance Standards	16.6A removed the construction time prohibition of 9pm to 7am. Construction & development make noise and vibration and can not be prohibited. Match muni-code Section 15-63
11/26/2021	16.6 Performance Standards	Article 16.6 B is missing
11/26/2021	16.6 Performance Standards	Article 16.6D (Dust) is too broad as to be unenforceable. We actually get Sahara dust in CLT during some times of the year. making it illegal doesn't make it stop
11/26/2021	16.6 Performance Standards	16.6E Odors & Fumes is not authorized in the ETJ per 160A-193 (only City plus 1 mile). Examples of the extent of the over-reach as written this makes it a violation of the UDO for CMU to vent sewer gas, or to have a BBQ grill or wood-burning fireplace
1/11/2022	16.6 Performance Standards	<p>A. Noise</p> <p>The term 'no use' should be revised to reflect that most noise is not from 'use' but from 'things'- generators, pumps, HVAC equipment, fans.</p> <p>This should read:</p> <p>No use, equipment, or activity shall be operated.....</p>
11/26/2021	16.7 Measurement Definitions and Methodologies	16.7 does not exist in the released version of the UDO. What are you hiding?
10/27/2021	17.1 General Standards for Accessory Structures	17.1(B): This is very restrictive and very problematic for large-scale, phased adaptive reuse projects.

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment
11/26/2021	17.1 General Standards for Accessory Structures; 17.2 Standards for Specific Accessory Structures	the edification of Accessory structure as incidental & subordinate doesn't help with the Article 17.1 C. A lot of incidental & subordinate structures do not take a building permit & should not require a Zoning permit- i.e. mailboxes, light poles, fences, walls). Change the wording in item C
11/26/2021	17.1 General Standards for Accessory Structures; 17.2 Standards for Specific Accessory Structures	17.1 D 2 - Clarify that an ADU is not an Accessory Structure.
11/26/2021	17.1 General Standards for Accessory Structures; 17.2 Standards for Specific Accessory Structures	17.1.E. why this size limitation? Older homes are small and generally have out building. this section needs to be removed
11/26/2021	17.1 General Standards for Accessory Structures; 17.2 Standards for Specific Accessory Structures	17.2 D (Fences & Walls) - the prohibition of vinyl is over restrictive. it's a popular fence material (regardless of zoning category) because it is low maintenance.

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment
11/26/2021	17.1 General Standards for Accessory Structures; 17.2 Standards for Specific Accessory Structures	prohibition of chain link with fence slats makes no sense. Fence slats when used on construction yards reduce the theft
11/26/2021	17.1 General Standards for Accessory Structures; 17.2 Standards for Specific Accessory Structures	Page 17-4 Retail Shipping Lockers regulated Cluster mailbox units in violation of federal & State law. Definition needs to specifically exempt federal mail boxes.
11/26/2021	17.1 General Standards for Accessory Structures; 17.2 Standards for Specific Accessory Structures	page 17-5 itemK - requirement to screen a back flow preventor or a duke transformer, or an AT&T box is excessive. Prohibition of the same type structures in the setback is ridiculous. Where else are they going to go? under the building? You tell Duke to put transformers on the back property line & see what reaction you get.
1/11/2022	17.1 General Standards for Accessory Structures; 17.2 Standards for Specific Accessory Structures	the edification of Accessory structure as incidental & subordinate doesn't help with the Article 17.1 C. A lot of incidental & subordinate structures do not take a building permit & should not require a Zoning permit- i.e. mailboxes, light poles, fences, walls). Change the wording in item C

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment
1/11/2022	17.1 General Standards for Accessory Structures; 17.2 Standards for Specific Accessory Structures	17.1 D 2 - Clarify that an ADU is not an Accessory Structure.
1/11/2022	17.1 General Standards for Accessory Structures; 17.2 Standards for Specific Accessory Structures	17.1.E. why this size limitation? Older homes are small and generally have out building. this section needs to be removed;
1/11/2022	17.1 General Standards for Accessory Structures; 17.2 Standards for Specific Accessory Structures	17.2 D (Fences & Walls) - the prohibition of vinyl is over restrictive. it's a popular fence material (regardless of zoning category) because it is low maintenance. prohibition of chain link with fence slats makes no sense. Fence slats when used on construction yards reduce the theft
1/11/2022	17.1 General Standards for Accessory Structures; 17.2 Standards for Specific Accessory Structures	Page 17-4 Retail Shipping Lockers regulated Cluster mailbox units in violation of federal & State law. Definition needs to specifically exempt federal mail boxes.

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment
1/11/2022	17.1 General Standards for Accessory Structures; 17.2 Standards for Specific Accessory Structures	page 17-5 itemK - requirement to screen a back flow preventor or a duke transformer, or an AT&T box is excessive. Prohibition of the same type structures in the setback is ridiculous. Where else are they going to go? under the building? You tell Duke to put transformers on the back property line & see what reaction you get.
1/11/2022	17.1 General Standards for Accessory Structures; 17.2 Standards for Specific Accessory Structures	GS 160D-908 makes fence wraps EXEMPT from zoning regulation. page 173- (section 17.2 D.b needs to reflect that law

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment
10/15/2021	17.2 Standards for Specific Accessory Structures	<p>The current draft does not allow ADU's to be built on lots where a duplex is the principle residence. I believe that to be inconsistent with the desired goals of the City for the following reasons.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Affordable Housing – Allowing ADU's to be added to existing duplexes would enable hundreds of current older NOAH units (of which I own two) to potentially add a third rental unit to the property. This would encourage owners of these affordable units to resist the offers to tear them down for newer, more expensive housing. The City wants to keep as many NOAH units as possible and this would be a logical incentive, consistent with that objective. Otherwise, it puts tremendous economic pressure on these owners to sell the properties to builders and developers as tear downs. 2. Logical Consistency – The current draft would enable owners to tear down the existing structure and build a triplex in its place but it won't allow a third unit to be added to the current duplex. That seems illogical. If an attached ADU was added to an existing duplex it would look similar to a triplex, yet would probably have cheaper rents on the two older units because newer units cost more. 3. Increased Density – Increasing the density in older neighborhoods enables the City to provide services at reduced costs per person. By adding these smaller units throughout the community that objective is accomplished without encountering the typical resistance toward new development. 4. Housing Variety within Communities – enabling ADU's to be built on lots with duplexes, increases the variety of housing types available within a community. Typically, the ADU's are small and appeal to single people (both younger and much older) not interested in apartment living for any number of reasons. This demographic has trouble finding housing currently as the supply is very limited. Mixing this type of housing in neighborhoods with larger housing provides a welcome mix. <p>Also, I would appreciate feedback on how the staff views this suggestion. Should they opt not to include this provision I would like to hear the reasons against it, so I can better understand the thought process. If I have overlooked some practical problems, I would like to know what those are. Thanks.</p>
10/27/2021	17.2 Standards for Specific Accessory Structures	17.2(D)(1)(b). Why regulate aesthetics like this? Why limit waiver to materials "deemed to be similar" - what if there's a different but aesthetically helpful fencing material?
10/27/2021	17.2 Standards for Specific Accessory Structures	17.2(H)(1) - what does "permitted only in association with" mean? What part of a particular mixed use development is "associated with non-residential uses"?
10/27/2021	17.2 Standards for Specific Accessory Structures	17.2(I)(2): A 40' dimension here is based on a suburban land use density.

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment
10/27/2021	17.2 Standards for Specific Accessory Structures	17.2(K)(2): Need an exception reading "unless otherwise impractical" --- for example, go visit 1701 N Graham St and 1801 N Graham St, where utilities had to go on the street-facing facade.
11/26/2021	18.2 Architectural Features: Specific Dwelling	18.2 B adding at grade patios to the definition of what is an extension of a principle structure makes no sense. Greenhouses are not part of the principle structure and should not be in the list either
11/26/2021	18.2 Architectural Features: Specific Dwelling	table 1-1 should remove Patios as an architectural feature
11/26/2021	18.2 Architectural Features: Specific Dwelling	table 18-1 should remove Patios as an architectural feature
11/26/2021	18.2 Architectural Features: Specific Dwelling	page 18-2 if breezeways are not permitted why do they have Building Design elements ascribed to them?
1/11/2022	18.2 Architectural Features: Specific Dwelling	18.2 B adding at grade patios to the definition of what is an extension of a principle structure makes no sense. Greenhouses are not part of the principle structure and should not be in the list either
1/11/2022	18.2 Architectural Features: Specific Dwelling	table 1-1 should remove Patios as an architectural feature
1/11/2022	18.2 Architectural Features: Specific Dwelling	table 18-1 should remove Patios as an architectural feature
1/11/2022	18.2 Architectural Features: Specific Dwelling	page 18-2 if breezeways are not permitted why do they have Building Design elements ascribed to them?
10/27/2021	19.10 Valet Parking Requirements	19.10: Exception for existing/historic buildings?
10/27/2021	19.11 Commercial Vehicle Storage	19.11: Is vehicle storage a defined term?
10/27/2021	19.11 Commercial Vehicle Storage	Also, 19.11(B) is not clear to me - what does this mean?

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment
1/14/2022	19.2 Vehicle Parking Space Requirements	Bicycles are vehicles as defined by NC DOT. Although vehicles as stated are motor vehicles with delineation between bicycles and motor vehicles there should not be a distinction. Motorized vehicle parking minimums need to be abolished. There is no free parking. What if the only free parking was for bikes, motorcycles, electric vehicles i.e. the vehicles we would like to encourage. Paid parking would be for internal combustion engines. What if the closest parking were for those aforementioned preferred vehicles? What if the closest, easiest, free parking and drop off were for public transit and preferred modes of transportation. We must create the world we want. Eliminate valet service for motorized v; Bicycles are vehicles as defined by NC DOT. Although vehicles as stated are motor vehicles with delineation between bicycles and motor vehicles there should not be a distinction. Motorized vehicle parking minimums need to be abolished. There is no free parking. What if the only free parking was for bikes, motorcycles, electric vehicles i.e. the vehicles we would like to encourage. Paid parking would be for internal combustion engines. What if the closest parking were for those aforementioned preferred vehicles? What if the closest, easiest, free parking and drop off were for public transit and preferred modes of transportation. We must create the world we want. Eliminate valet service for motorized vehicles. Mandate those spots furthest away and charge for them. Encourage drop off zones for ride hailing services. Discourage single occupancy vehicles. Bike parking standards should accommodate all types of bikes with racks, bags, recumbents, cargo bikes. Adequate clearance and spacing is needed. U locks must be usable on such racks. Bike lockers and shower facilities should be mandated for all parking garages and some for public use.
1/7/2022	19.3 Required Electric Vehicle Charging Stations	Section 19.3 - EV-Capable and EV-Ready space calculation should be clarified that they are cumulative requirements vs concurrent requirements (ie 10% EV-Ready doesn't fulfill half of the 20% EV-Capable requirement).
1/7/2022	19.3 Required Electric Vehicle Charging Stations	Section 19.3 - 20% EV-Capable seems excessive and cost-prohibitive for public parking structures (think it's fine for residential). For example the current Panther's deck at Mint St would need 444 spaces EV-Capable, another 222 spaces EV-Ready, and 45 spaces EVSE-Installed. They currently have 24 EV spaces and the deck is owned by Duke Energy (ie if anyone is leading the way on installing chargers they should be). I would suggest going from 20/10 to 10/5.
1/7/2022	19.3 Required Electric Vehicle Charging Stations	Section 19.3 - there should be a requirement that parking for office buildings also include EV charging. I would recommend 10% EV-Capable, 5% EV-Ready, 2% EVSE-Installed.
1/7/2022	19.3 Required Electric Vehicle Charging Stations;	Section 19.3 - EV-Capable and EV-Ready space calculation should be clarified that they are cumulative requirements vs concurrent requirements (ie 10% EV-Ready doesn't fulfill half of the 20% EV-Capable requirement).
1/7/2022	19.3 Required Electric Vehicle Charging Stations;	Section 19.3 - 20% EV-Capable seems excessive and cost-prohibitive for public parking structures (think it's fine for residential). For example the current Panther's deck at Mint St would need 444 spaces EV-Capable, another 222 spaces EV-Ready, and 45 spaces EVSE-Installed. They currently have 24 EV spaces and the deck is owned by Duke Energy (ie if anyone is leading the way on installing chargers they should be). I would suggest going from 20/10 to 10/5.

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment
1/7/2022	19.3 Required Electric Vehicle Charging Stations;	Section 19.3 - there should be a requirement that parking for office buildings also include EV charging. I would recommend 10% EV-Capable, 5% EV-Ready, 2% EVSE-Installed.
10/27/2021	19.3 Required Electric Vehicle Charging Stations; 19.6 Design of Surface Parking and Parking Lots; 19.7 Design of Parking Structures	19.3(c)(1) - why are we not following regular math, where we round down up to .49 and round up from .5?
10/27/2021	19.6 Design of Surface Parking and Parking Lots	19.6(A)(2)(b)(II)(A): Recommend clarifying when existing lots need to be improved or removed entirely - just restriping? renovating part of building that uses an existing, non-conforming lot? If just part of the building is renovated, how much of the lot has to be upgraded or removed?; 19.7(B)(2): Why must garage screening resemble adjacent buildings? Stop regulating aesthetics.
11/26/2021	19.6 Design of Surface Parking and Parking Lots	19.6A 1. a. i. needs to say single-family detached
11/26/2021	19.6 Design of Surface Parking and Parking Lots	19.6 A. 1. a. 1. (c) would remove the allowance for on street parking to count for a % of required parking. Why remove that?
11/26/2021	19.6 Design of Surface Parking and Parking Lots	19.6A 1. 1.iii. (c) appears to remove the flexibility of a 3-car garage or a circular driveway . Why remove that owners option?
10/27/2021	19.7 Design of Parking Structures	19.7(B)(3): Any openings, including those not facing a street?
10/27/2021	19.7 Design of Parking Structures	19.7(B)(3): This rule presumes a large, flat, suburban site with few constraints. It is also regulating aesthetics.
10/27/2021	19.7 Design of Parking Structures	19.7(B)(4) - can any garage meeting these screening requirements meet the air-flow requirements to be non-sprinkled? It seems like not. If there must be a 4' tall wall AND 50% of the opening above the wall must be blocked by the features specified, it seems like all garages in charlotte will need sprinklers.
10/27/2021	19.7 Design of Parking Structures	19.7(C)(1)(c): What does it mean to require a fully wrapped parking garage to be articulated?

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment
10/27/2021	19.7 Design of Parking Structures	19.7(c)(2)(c): Exclude fire stairs from the calculation? 90% will be very hard to reach otherwise.
1/7/2022	19.7 Design of Parking Structures	Section 19.7 - consider unintended consequences of only applying parking deck screening to facades abutting a frontage. Decks should be screened on all sides not already screened by an adjacent building. FNB tower is screened on all frontages but has exposed deck that is highly visible to the whole city on the two sides next to the Mint St deck. Portman's the Line in South End has a massive parking deck that only has one frontage on Hawkins St. The side facing the Rail Trail should absolutely have parking deck screening on the entire deck, as well as the part that faces the recording studio (which isn't on any frontage but is still visible to everyone in South End.
1/7/2022	19.7 Design of Parking Structures	Section 19.7 - consider unintended consequences of only applying parking deck screening to facades abutting a frontage. Decks should be screened on all sides not already screened by an adjacent building. FNB tower is screened on all frontages but has exposed deck that is highly visible to the whole city on the two sides next to the Mint St deck. Portman's the Line in South End has a massive parking deck that only has one frontage on Hawkins St. The side facing the Rail Trail should absolutely have parking deck screening on the entire deck, as well as the part that faces the recording studio (which isn't on any frontage but is still visible to everyone in South End.
1/11/2022	19.7 Design of Parking Structures	Lighting of parking structures can be disruptive to adjacent residential areas and streets. I suggest adding: Internal deck lighting which is visible from adjacent property or streets shall be shielded to meet the 'semi cut off' standard of these regulations in 16.2. Lighting for covered driveway entry/exit shall be full cut off shielded.
10/7/2021	19.9 Design of Bicycle Parking	The distinction between short- and long-term bike parking is basically whether it's covered or not. For someone who commutes to work, simply having a roof over your bike is insufficient. Long-term bike parking must be secure (restricted access via key, passcard, etc), and ideally, it would be accompanied by a facility with personal lockers and showers. Simply requiring buildings to have the small amount of space required to park a bike is not sufficient to encourage more people to bike to work. Additional infrastructure is needed, and the UDO is the place to put teeth into regulations that address how our city is built. Why spend time and effort to write a code that doesn't go nearly far enough in addressing the gaps in our built environment?
11/26/2021	20.1 Required Loading Spaces; 20.3 Required Solid Waste Service Areas	title of 201. needs to change to read Required Loading Spaces/ Areas
1/11/2022	20.1 Required Loading Spaces; 20.3 Required Solid Waste Service Areas	title of 201. needs to change to read Required Loading Spaces/ Areas

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment
10/27/2021	21.1 Purpose	21.2(a) Why is City regulating all plant material? Needlessly controlling.
11/26/2021	21.10 Landscape Yard for Residential Subdivisions Abutting Limited Access Roads	21.10 B - setbacks should be allowed to included Landscape yards
1/11/2022	21.10 Landscape Yard for Residential Subdivisions Abutting Limited Access Roads	21.10 B - setbacks should be allowed to included Landscape yards
10/25/2021	21.12 Required Screening for Loading and Service Areas	<p>My comment is in relation to 21.12 (not Article 17) . We would like to see some language that allows for landscape screening in lieu of opaque wall and gates. The old code allowed for landscape screening of waste containers but the UDO does not. That is understandable when considering the traditional dumpster but this is a newer technology and has a lot of benefits that traditional waste containers don't. I am specifically talking about waste containers that are partially in the ground such as EnviroBIN. Molok or Sutera. I am sure there are other brands as well. Both Knoxville and Nashville had recently written text amendments to use in-ground waste containers as alternate without opaque screening and gates. We are willing to provide the language that Nashville Metro used. This is also a common way of handling trash in Europe and in Canada. Here are some websites that show these types of containers www.ingroundwastecontainer.com www.sutera-inground.com www.molokna.com</p> <p>Here are some of the benefits to in-ground waste containers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Easier to load No run-off of “dumpster juice” Helps meets Sustainability goals No access for pests/ rodents / vermin Rotomolded PE container, will not rust. More attractive design. No gates to maintain. In-ground waste stays cooler therefore the odor is reduced Gravity locked lid, no bulky items in container (mattresses, tires, etc) <p>We have, of course, a lot more supporting documentation that we can send including pictures from at least 1500 projects to date.</p> <p>Contact Info: Greg Carmichael greg.carmichael@binovagroup.com 865-244-9312</p>

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment
1/6/2022	21.12 Required Screening for Loading and Service Areas	Re: screening for dumpsters, etc... consider doing away with the gate/ door requirement. The gates/ doors seem to almost always not get the maintenance they need, and they quickly sag, break, or start to fall apart, often at the hands of abuse from waste haulers. They also dont always get closed, which pretty much negates their existence.
1/6/2022	21.12 Required Screening for Loading and Service Areas	<p>RE: Article 21 Screening for dumpsters</p> <p>I was able to join the virtual session (Jan 6th) regarding Parking, Landscape Screening etc. and had asked about using landscaping in lieu of opaque walls when using in-ground type waste containers. Other cities in the area have adopted this; Nashville, Knoxville, Spartanburg, Greenville SC, along w smaller towns because they can see the advantage of these type receptacles over traditional dumpsters. Removing the enclosure requirement incentivizes contractors/designers to use this system because it is more cost effective. The question on the chat came down to considering the removal of the requirement for gates on the enclosures if CLT isn't willing to change the wall requirement. Arista - CAMIROS asked if we could give some reasons for removing the gate requirement. I will attempt to do that here:</p> <p>Dumpster Enclosure gates are by definition very high maintenance Gates are more-often-than-not, left open When left open they are often a hazard to pedestrians and traffic in the parking lot Gates not secured can blow open/shut causing injury to someone in the way Gates require more room on a site plan as does the enclosure itself. Gates are often damaged by the waste hauler and become very unsightly Sustainability: An enclosure with gates takes 3 min longer to service by a waste hauler. Time, Risk to driver, and fuel burn add up to be very costly over a city the size of CLT. One truck services 100 dumpsters a day typically. 50% of those will have gates. 50 stops X 3 min is 2.5 hours for one truck, on one route, for one day. How many dumpster trucks are servicing CLT every day? Likely 75 or more. If the container inside is a low profile and aesthetically pleasing then there is no reason to hide it.</p> <p>I have not touched on the merits of using in-ground waste containers, as I have sent this prior, but property developers and contractors will not use a better/premium solution if they have to spend the same amount to enclose it. Without the enclosure in-ground containers are much less investment and provide many more benefits to society than traditional dumpsters. Here are some brands of this type container: www.binovagroup.com/envirobin sutera-inground.com molokna.com</p>
10/27/2021	21.2 Selection, Installation, and Maintenance	21.2(E) Why are existing plantings only counted sometimes?
10/27/2021	21.5 Parking Lot Perimeter Landscape	21.5(B) - "Native" is not a specific enough term - I recommend rephrasing as a prohibition on plants listed on (a particular list) of invasive plants.

Date	UDO Section	Public Comment
10/27/2021	21.9 Landscape Yard	21.9 - this scale is inappropriate for dense, urban locations. A 100' landscaped yard! Even a 40' landscaped yard is unreasonable in an urban location. Example: as I read this, a "corner store" in a residential district would need a 40' landscaped yard between the store and the adjacent houses ---- that's not a walkable corner store! Similarly, requiring a 100' landscaped yard between TOD district and the adjacent district makes it less comfortable and pleasant to walk from those adjoining areas to the transit stop.
10/27/2021	22.6 Standards for Signs Exempt from a Permit	22.6(B)(1) - only one accessory use sign no matter how big the project? No matter how many frontages? No matter how many buildings?;
10/27/2021	22.6 Standards for Signs Exempt from a Permit	22.6(G)(6) - recommend carving out from these limitations signage for wayfinding within a development. At least, consider clarifying whether wayfinding is advertising.;
11/26/2021	22.6 Standards for Signs Exempt from a Permit	22.6 C why are banner not allowed in residential uses? they would be very appropriate for the residential portion of a mixed use development
1/11/2022	22.6 Standards for Signs Exempt from a Permit	22.6 C why are banner not allowed in residential uses? they would be very appropriate for the residential portion of a mixed use development
10/27/2021	22.8 Summary of Sign Permissions	22.8(D)(2)(a) - why are you regulating aesthetics such as by requiring that all ground signs be "of monument type construction.";
10/27/2021	22.9 Signs Requiring A Permit	Table 22-3: Consider allowing taller signs if the provide rain protection to someone standing at the sign (such as a wayfinding kiosk)